

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were submitted for examination. Claim 7 is cancelled. Claims 1-6, 8-20 remain in the case.

Claims 1-6, 8-20 stand rejected. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Okutsu (U.S. 5,630,062). Claims 2-6, 8-20, while not explicitly rejected under any code section, are referenced in the section addressed under 35 USC § 102.

SUPPORT IN THE SPECIFICATION FOR AMENDMENTS

The amended claims are all supported by multiple references in the specification. This section cites specific sections of the specification which provide support for the amendments. The list is not exhaustive as many other references also support the amendments.

Claim 1 amendments: The reference in the preamble to "enabling a printer feature" is supported in the specification. Page 7, lines 21-23 refer to "dormant features" as "features of the printer such as extra fonts, additional capabilities, automatic drum rotation, and the like...." Page 8, lines 6-7 refer to a "feature enablement module" "to enable selected dormant features"

The phrase "to create a printer specific pass code" is supported by several references in the specification including Page 10, lines 21, indicating that the some unique characteristic of the printer, such as its serial number, is to be used as a "seed for the generation of the customer pass code." Also, the abstract states that the system generates "a unique pass code for printers."

The phrase "communicating the pass code to the printer" is supported by several references including page 11, line 13: "the customer then enters the customer pass code 23 into the printer 12 at a step 122."

The phrase "enabling a previously disabled printer feature following the successful validation of the pass code by the printer" is supported by several references including page 4, lines 1-3 in which a "feature enablement module" is configured "to enable a previously disabled

feature of the printer in response to the validation module validating the mathematically manipulated character string as a correct pass code for the printer.”

Claim 11 amendment: Similar phrases from amendment 1 are supported as illustrated under Claim 1 amendment.

In addition, the phrase “a verification module configured to validate...” is supported by several references including page 4, lines 1-3, in which a “feature enablement module” is configured “to enable a previously disabled feature of the printer in response to the validation module validating the mathematically manipulated character string as a correct pass code for the printer.”

Claim 13 amendment: This is simply a grammatical change which follows the grammatical usage of Claim 12.

Claim 14 amendment: The term “unique” character string is supported by several references in the specification including page 7, line 13 which states that the serial number is a preferably “unique” number and that some other unique characteristic could also be used (line 15).

Claim 17 amendment: Support for encoding selected features for enablement directly into the pass code is found at page 12, lines 6-8: which states that selection of features for enablement may be “assigned a code that is embedded into the mathematical manipulations” obviating the need for the customer to “enter[] the separate code.” (lines 9-10).

Claim 18 and 19 amendments: Support previously described under claim 14 above.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7 and 17 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

The examiner rejected claims 7 and 17 as being indefinite. In particular, the examiner found the phrase “a previously dormant feature of the printer” to be unclear. Claim 7 has been cancelled and claim 17 has been amended to use a different phrase.

Claims 1, 11 and 17 use the phrase “a previously disabled printer feature.” The applicant respectfully refers the examiner to page 7, lines 21-23; page 8, lines 6-7; page 4, lines 1-3. In these sections, the applicant explains that printers may have certain disabled features, sometimes

referred to as dormant features, which may be enabled or disabled. Specific examples of possible disabled features are offered including "extra fonts, additional capabilities, automatic drum rotation, and the like...." These features are referred to as dormant features and as disabled features which may be enabled according to the present invention.

The applicant respectfully submits the amendments to traverse the rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS under 35 USC § 102(b)

The following is a quotation of the cited paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 from the Office Action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Each and every element of the claimed invention must exist in a single prior art reference in order for the reference to constitute the same invention as the claimed invention. Claims 1-6, 8-20 were rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Okutsu. The amendments to the two independent claims, 1 and 11, both emphasize that the "pass code" must be validated before "enabling" "a previously disabled printer feature." This clearly makes the two independent claims and all of their dependent claims distinct from Okutsu since Okutsu does not disclose a method of enabling previously disabled printer features.

Okutsu utilizes a printer unique serial number for selection of a printer with printer capabilities necessary to a particular print job. In no part of Okutsu does it reference the ability to dynamically modify the capabilities of specific printers.

The Office Action states "with regard to claims 7 and 17 as best understood, Okutsu discloses enabling a previously dormant feature of the printer...(column 7, lines 51-60)." The amendments to claims 1, 11, and 17 address any indefiniteness that may have existed. The currently amended claims clearly refer to printer features that may be disabled and subsequently

enabled – “enabling” “a previously disabled printer feature.” Okutsu in the referenced section does not refer to a manipulation of the capabilities of a printer. Rather, Okutsu refers to the manipulation of an “ID character string” used for communication between a group of printers. (column 7, line 51).

Column 7, lines 1-60, is a complicated discussion of the passing of a print job among a plurality of printers on a network. The issuing printer, not having the ability to properly print a requested print job, issues a “print capability information requirement command to other printers connected to the network.” (Col. 7, ll. 3-5.) The phrase “the printer sets the ID character string read out from the printer ID storage unit in the command issuing side ID” is a very confusing phrase that is very difficult to parse grammatically. This phrase refers to a command string (ID character string) which is read from the printer ID storage unit. When the printer “sets” a value in this string, it is simply communicating with the other printers, trying to locate a printer with the proper printer capabilities. It sets a value in a set of bytes to be transmitted over the network to other printers. In no way does this action cause the printer to change its own printer capabilities as is the case with the present invention. Nor does this action cause recipient printers to change their print capabilities.

Applicant agrees that Okutsu uses printer IDs and that these IDs are manipulated. However, the manipulations do not cause the printers to modify their printer capabilities. These manipulations are carried out to execute a search operation for a printer with a preset group of print capabilities.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the subject matter of the claimed invention as currently amended is not anticipated by Okutsu.

Applicant therefore respectfully asserts that claims 1-6, and 8-20 are in condition for prompt allowance.

Should additional information be required regarding the traversal claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 1, 2005
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929